

### Remarks

The present amendment is in response to the action mailed in the above-referenced case on July 09, 1999. Claims 1-20 are presented for Examination. In the action the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Meske et al. (US No. 5,530,852) hereinafter Meske. Claims 10, 12, 14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over Meske in view of Judson (US No. 5,572,643).

In response applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as patentable, and to distinguish unarguably over the prior art provided by the Examiner. Applicant has amended the claims to clearly recite that the characteristics of a client device includes hardware and/or software used by the client. Applicant herein adds claims 21-37 for examination.

Claim 1 as amended now recites:

1. *In a WEB browsing system, a method for minimizing data to be transmitted to a client device from a Web server, comprising steps of:*
  - (a) creating a listing of parameters derived from one or more of hardware and software characteristics of the client device, characteristics of a WEB page, and preferences of a customer using the client device;*
  - (b) storing the parameters as a template at the Web server;*
  - (c) accessing a WEB page requested by the customer;*
  - (d) translating the WEB data according to the template; and*



*(e) transmitting the translated data to the client device.*

Claim 1 is rejected under 102 (e) as being anticipated by Meske.

Applicant herein amends claim 1 to clarify that the characteristics of the client device includes one or more of hardware and software characteristics.

In applicant's invention the WEB server first processes data requested to be transmitted to a specific client's device according to pre-stored characteristics of the specific user's device, or according to characteristics transmitted by the user's device. For example, a user's device could be a hand-held computer, and devices like WEB TV systems, Set-Top boxes, and the like. These types of devices may have varying CPU capacities, data transmission speeds, and operate with different software applications. In some instances only multi-media extensions supported by the user's device are used, and data is preferably combined into one file for each transfer. In this manner, each communication with each user's device is done in a fast and efficient manner, tailored to the needs of each user, and the user can then function with a minimum hardware/software device that may be energy efficient providing long life between battery charges. Because the server is capable of storing characteristics of the client device at the server the server is capable of converting data to be specifically tailored according to characteristics of the client's device, and then communicates the data to the client's device. In this manner, for example, a client using a hand held computing device, having a smaller computing capacity than a standard PC can download WEB pages and other data from a server that would otherwise be impossible.

Regarding claim 2, applicant herein amends the claim to clarify that the display is in fact a display apparatus part of the client's device, for example, a LCD display, LED display, monochrome etc.. For example,



graphics are processed by the WEB server, using information provided in the template stored at the server, to provide specific resolution and size according to the specific client's display apparatus.

Applicant has studied the art of Meske in detail and has failed to find any teaching or suggestion of creating a template as a listing of parameters derived from one or more of hardware and software characteristics of the client device, characteristics of a WEB page, and preferences of a customer using the client device and storing the parameters as a template at the Web server.

The art of Meske fairly teaches a computer- implemented method and system for retrieving information. The art of Meske provides an ability to sort through the large variety of electronic sources in order to generate a subset of the stories available in electronic form which is tailored to a client's specific interests and desires. Meske basically teaches a system wherein a client sends a request **110** for news items to a server **150**. The server then may perform scanning and searching of raw (unprocessed) information sources (e.g. newswire feeds or news groups), based upon the client's request, presents the filtered electronic information as server responses **160** to the client process. The server in the system of Meske may receive an e-mail in Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML) as a response to the search for raw new information. The HTML versions of articles stored in the SGML mail message are searched for the presence of specified search terms using a SGML/HTML parser/converter process **400**. The HTML results of these specified search requests can then be displayed on a client's console.

Meske teaches client profiles having to do with the type of information desired by the client, for example, if the client is interested in current events, politics, or economics.

There is absolutely no teaching in the art of Meske of a capability to transmit information to a client based on the hardware and/or software characteristics of the client device. Applicant believes claim 1 is patentable over the art of Meske. Claims 2 is patentable on it's own merits or at least as depended from patentable claim 1.

Claim 3 as amended herein recites:

*3. A software template for use in translating WEB data to a reduced-data form to be transmitted to a client device from a WEB server, comprising:*

*one or more parameters derived from one or more of hardware and software characteristics of the client device; and*

*control routines adapted for applying the parameters in translating data from a WEB page for transmission to the client device.*

Claim 3 is also rejected under 102(e) and is rejected using the same reasoning as set forth in claims 1 and 2. Applicant has also made a similar amendment to claim 3 as was made in claim 1. Claim 3 now recites a software template for translating WEB data to a reduced-data form to be transmitted from a WEB server to a client's device based on one or more of hardware and software characteristics of the client device.

As argued above on behalf of claim 1, Meske clearly fails to disclose transmitting data to a client based on characteristics of the client device. The WEB server in applicant's invention may have to reformat the transmission of data, via a template, when transmitting to the client to accommodate specific characteristics of the hardware and software capabilities of the client's device. Applicant believes claim 3 is patentable over the art of Meske. Claims 4-5 are patentable on their own merits or at least as depended from a patentable claim.



Claim 6 as amended herein recites:

*6. In a WEB browsing system using templates listing parameters derived from one or more of hardware and software characteristics of a client device, characteristics of a WEB page, and customer preferences in reducing data content of files to be transmitted to the client device, a template editor comprising:*

*a client interface for displaying characteristics of the template; and tools for altering the characteristics.*

Claim 6 is rejected by the Examiner using the same reasoning as provided for claims 1 and 2. Applicant has herein similarly amended claim 6 to recite that the characteristics of the client's device include one or more of hardware and software. As argued on behalf of claims 1 and 2, Meske fails to teach this claimed ability. Applicant believes claim 6 is clearly patentable over the art of Meske. Claims 7-8 are also patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 9 as amended herein recites:

*9. In a WEB browsing system, a Mark-Script for use by a WEB server hosting a customer operating a client device, the Mark-Script comprising:*

*a list of Web pages to be accessed on behalf of the client; and control routines adapted for accessing the WEB pages one-after-another and storing the contents at the WEB server for transmission on demand to the client device based on one or more of hardware and software characteristics of the client device.*

*A*

Claim 9 is rejected using the same reasoning provided for claim 1. Applicant herein amends claim 9 to also recite the transmission of data from the WEB server to the client's device being dependent on the one or more of hardware and software characteristics of the client's device. Further, the Examiner's basis for rejection for claim 1 simply does not deal with the unique limitation of using Mark-Script.

There are products in the art that provide for setting up a sequence for accessing WEB pages. In these products a sequence of URLs is entered, and the computer then accesses the WEB pages in order and catalogues the results, as in the art of Meske. This is different than the system of the present invention. In the present invention a list of WEB page destinations is stored either at a client device or at an enabled WEB server. The system comprises not just the list of destinations, but executable control routines for implementing the accessing of the listed destinations and controlling interaction between a server and the client. The inventor terms the combination a Mark-Script, which is a cross between a list of bookmarks and a script.

In applicant's invention a Mark-Script for use by a WEB server hosting a customer operating a client device is provided. The Mark-Script comprises a list of Web pages to be accessed on behalf of the client; and control routines adapted for accessing the WEB pages one-after-another and storing the contents at the WEB server for transmission on demand to the client device.

As an example of a Mark-Script and execution according to an embodiment of the present invention, a client uploads a sequence of URLs to a WEB Server adapted for reduced-content data sharing according to the present invention. The client may then provide an initiation signal identifying

A

the Mark-Script, and the server will access the first destination of the Mark-Script, translate the content according to the user's template, including the hardware and/or software characteristics of the client's device, and transmit the result to the client device. While the user is viewing the first result, the Mark-Script accesses the second destination, performs the translation, and queues the data for transmission to the user after the user is finished with the data from the first destination.

Meske simply does not teach this kind of sophisticated control in the downloading of desired articles. Meske also fails to teach transmission of data based on the detailed characteristics of the client's device as argued.

Applicant believes claim 9 is patentable over the art of Meske. Claim 10 is also patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 11 recites:

*11. A method for WEB browsing by a client device, comprising steps of:*

*(a) preparing a Mark-Script comprising a list of Web pages to be accessed on behalf of the client device, and control routines adapted for accessing the WEB pages one-after-another and storing the contents at the WEB server for transmission on demand to the client device;*

*(b) accessing the WEB server by the client device and initiating execution of the Mark-Script; and*

*(c) interacting with WEB pages transmitted by the WEB server to the client device according to the list and to characteristics of the client device including one or more of hardware and software.*

Claim 11 is rejected by the Examiner using the same reasoning provided on behalf of claim 9, which stems back to claim 1. The Examiner

A handwritten signature, possibly 'A', is located in the bottom right corner of the page.

also states that Meske teaches the step of accessing the WEB server by the client device and initiating execution of the Mark-Script (i.e. HTML files to SGML files). As seen in columns 9 and 10 of Meske advanced control routines are not available in the transmission of files to the client as taught in applicant's invention.

Applicant believes claim 11 is patentable over the art of Meske as amended. Claim 12 is also patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 13 as amended herein recites:

*13. A method for sequential browsing by a server on behalf of a client device, comprising steps of:*

- (a) accessing a Mark-Script stored at the server and associated with the client device, the Mark-Script listing a sequence of WEB pages to be accessed for the client;*
- (b) accessing the listed WEB pages and storing the retrieved data at the server; and*
- (c) transmitting the stored pages to the client device on demand based on one or more of software and software characteristics of the client device.*

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 using the same reasoning set forth on behalf of claims 1 and 11. Applicant has again added, by amendment, the recitation of transmitting data according to the one or more of hardware and software characteristics of the client's device. Applicant believes claim 13 is patentable over the art of Meske as argued on behalf of claim 1 and 11 above. Claims 14-17 are also patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

A

Claim 18 as amended herein recites:

*18. A system for Internet browsing, comprising:*

*a host computer connected to one or more peripheral devices and to the Internet; and*

*a WEB server adapted for browsing the Internet for the host;*

*wherein the WEB server fetches WEB pages for the host computer and reduces data content before transmission to the host based on one or more of hardware and software characteristics of one of the peripheral devices connected to the host.*

The Examiner rejects claim 18 under 102(e) as being unpatentable over Meske. The Examiner merely recites back the language of applicant's claim, but does not support the teaching of a host computer, a WEB server, and a peripheral device in the portions of Meske references on page 4 of the Office Letter.

There are many existing devices, and more devices being developed, that may communicate locally with a computer which may in turn communicate with remote data sources over networks like the Internet. A device adapted to communicate with computers locally, acting as a computer peripheral device, for example, may benefit a client indirectly, with the host device accessing the Internet or other WAN, downloading data specifically reduced in data content according to characteristics of the peripheral device, and then communicating the data to the peripheral device.

Meske does not teach the downloading or transmission of data to a peripheral device other than the WEB server 150 and the host computer 100. Further, Meske is not capable of transmitting data to any type of client

A

device based on one or more of hardware and software characteristics as argued above.

Applicant believes claim 18 is clearly patentable over the art of Meske. Claim 19 is also patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 20 as amended herein recites:

*20. A system for Internet browsing comprising a client device connected to a WEB server [adapted to browse] for browsing legacy system sites on the client's behalf, the system comprising:*

*a source-side template [adapted] for converting data requested by the WEB server to an Hyper Text Markup Protocol (HTML) before transmission to the WEB server; and*

*a client-side template for reducing data content of the data at the Web site according to one or more of hardware and software characteristics supplied by the client device before transmission of the data to the client device.*

Claim 20 is rejected by the Examiner using the same reasoning provided on behalf of claims 1 and 19. The Examiner further states that Meske teaches a source side template adapted for converting data requested by the WEB server to an Hyper Text Markup Protocol (HTML) before transmission to the WEB server. Applicant herein amends claim 20 to recite that the client-side template reduces the data for transmission according to the hardware and or software characteristics supplied by the client device before transmission.

Meske's SGML/HTML parser/converter process 400, implemented

A

in PERL script communicates with the server via CGI 220. The HTML versions of articles stored in the SGML mail message, sent to the server by the news source, are searched for the presence of specified search terms using the SGML/HTML parser/converter. The HTML results of these specified search requests can then be displayed on a client's console.

Meske does not teach wherein the transmission of data is according to characteristics of the client device, being provided by the client device. Meske's basic system of converting SGML to HTML and sending data to a client simply does not read on client's claim 20. There is absolutely no ability taught in the art of Meske to acquire or receive hardware and/or software characteristics from a client's device and transmit data accordingly. Claim 20 is patentable as amended as argued above and on behalf of claim 1.

Claim 21, newly added herein recites:

*21. A computing system comprising:*

*a client; and*

*a server having server control routines and connected to the client by a data link;*

*wherein the server control routines, upon a request to download by a client, determine one or more of hardware and software characteristics of the client, transpose data, without further negotiation with the client, and transmit the transposed data to the client in a form specifically adapted to the characteristics of the client, and wherein, in the transposing, a first set of files is transposed into a second set of files fewer in number than the first set of files.*

A

Newly added claim 21 encompasses the patentable limitations previously argued on behalf of the independent claims above, and a limitation that the transposing involves creating a second set of files fewer from a first set. Meske simply does not teach a WEB server having server control routines, wherein upon a request to download by a client, determines one or both of hardware or software characteristics of the client, transposes data, without further negotiation with the client, and transmits the transposed data to the client in a form specifically adapted to the characteristics of the client, and as a set of fewer files than a first set.

Applicant believes claim 21 is patentable over the art provided by the Examiner. Depended claims 22-26 are patentable on their own merits or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 27, newly added, herein recites:

*27. A server in a client-server system comprising:*

*a data port for connecting to a client;  
a facility for accessing data to be transferred to the client; and  
control routines for managing data preparation and transfer to the client:*

*wherein the control routines establish one or more of hardware and software characteristics of the client's device and, in response to a download request from the client, prepare and transmit data to the client in a form specifically adapted to the characteristics of the client, and wherein the control routines, in preparing the data for transfer to the client, transpose, without further negotiation with the client, a first set of files into a second set of files fewer in number than the first set of files before transferring the data to the client.*

A

Claim 27 discloses a server in a client-server system having control routines for establishing one or more of hardware and software characteristics of the client's device. As argued previously in this case, Meske does not teach the ability to transpose and transmit data to a client based on the specific characteristics of the client's device, or reducing the number of files..

Applicant believes claim 27 is patentable over the art provided by the Examiner. Claims 28-32 are patentable on their own merits or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 33, newly added herein recites:

*33. A method for transferring data originally comprising multiple files by a server to a client, comprising steps of:*

*(a) determining at the server, upon a request to download by a client, one or more of specific hardware and software characteristics of the client;*

*(b) transposing the data, without further negotiation with the client, according to the specific characteristics of the client, including reducing the number of files comprising the data; and*

*(c) transferring the transposed data to the client over a data link connecting the client to the server.*

Claim 33 is applicant's newly added method claim corresponding to claim 27, and is patentable using the same reasoning provided by the applicant on behalf of claims 21 and 27. Claims 34-37 are patentable on their own merits or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

A

Applicant believes the claims as amended, and the newly added claims presented for examination are patentable to applicant over the references cited and applied, and therefore requests reexamination and that the case be passed quickly to issue.

If there are any extensions of time required beyond an extension specifically petitioned and paid with this response, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid by check with this response, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dan Kikinis

by   
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys  
Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457

A